

**SELECTION STATEMENT FOR RFP5-12345-8629
WALLOPS INSTITUTIONAL CONSOLIDATED CONTRACT (WICC)**

On July 9, 2001, I, along with officials of the Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), met with the Chairperson of the WICC Source Evaluation Board (SEB), voting members, nonvoting members, and advisors to the WICC SEB for the purpose of selecting a source for the WICC.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The successful Offeror will provide the GSFC's Wallops Flight Facility (WFF) with institutional services that support the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Navy, and other WFF tenants and partners.

The resulting contract will be a cost plus incentive fee contract with some indefinite delivery indefinite quantity portions and award term provisions. The contract duration includes a 4-year core period with a potential for the Contractor to earn 6 additional award-term years for a potential maximum of 10 years.

Proposals were received from the following nine companies. The proposal from Offeror 9, JODAN Inc. was determined to be unacceptable because it did not represent a reasonable initial effort to address the essential requirements of the RFP:

Offeror 1 Call Henry, Inc. (CHI)

Offeror 2: OMNI Corp.

Offeror 3: CUBE Corp.

Offeror 4: H&H Consolidated, Inc.

Offeror 5: Griffin Services, Inc.

Offeror 6: Mission First Team (CSI & Occu-Health)

Offeror 7: EASI Corp.

Offeror 8: JWK International Corp.

Offeror 9: JODAN Services

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

This procurement was conducted in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation, (FAR), source selection procedures, and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.370-NASA. The RFP for this procurement was released on July 10, 2000. The following streamlined acquisition techniques were used:

Past Performance - A questionnaire was included as part of the RFP. Offerors were responsible for ensuring that the completed questionnaires were sent directly from their references to the Government by the proposal due date.

Special Techniques – The solicitation required offerors to present an oral "road map" to their proposals. The Oral Presentations were not part of the evaluation. Offerors were required to submit the following items in writing: a complete response to subfactor "A" Technical Approach and subfactor "B" Overall Management Approach; a Cost volume; and a Business Management volume.

The points allocated to the Mission Suitability Subfactors as specified in the solicitation were:

Subfactor A, Technical Approach	500 points
Subfactor B, Overall Contract Management Approach	500 points
Total points	1000 points

The SEB adjectively rated, and point scored the proposals under each Mission Suitability Subfactor in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A).

Cost/Price and Past Performance were evaluated by the SEB in accordance with the FAR and the NFS.

The solicitation stated the following regarding the relative weight of the evaluation factors:

"The Cost\Price Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual factors, the Mission Suitability Factor is more important than the Cost/Price Factor, which is more important that the Past Performance Factor."

RESULTS OF INITIAL EVALUATION

On April 4, 2001, I, along with officials of the GSFC, met with the Chairperson of the WICC SEB, voting members, nonvoting members, and advisors to the WICC SEB to review the SEB's evaluation of the proposals submitted in response to Request for Proposal (RFP) 5-12345-8629, for the WICC procurement. Based on the ratings of each proposal against all evaluation criteria (FAR 15.306(c)), the proposals

submitted by Call Henry, OMNI, CUBE, and H&H were determined to be the most highly rated proposals.

The SEB's evaluation established that four proposals, submitted by Griffin Services, MFT, EASI, and JWK, had a number of significant weaknesses and weaknesses in their technical proposals that would require major rewrites of most or all of their technical proposals in order to be competitive. Their probable costs and ratings in past performance did not improve their position enough to warrant ratings as the most highly rated proposals.

Therefore, I found that the proposals submitted by Call Henry, OMNI, CUBE, and H&H were the only proposals included in the competitive range for discussions. Proposals submitted by Griffin, MFT, EASI, and JWK were not included in the competitive range and were not considered further for award.

FINAL PROPOSAL REVISIONS (FPR's)

Discussions were conducted with all four offerors as prescribed by the FAR. At the completion of discussions, FPR's were requested. The following are the results of the evaluation of FPR's.

MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

CUBE Corporation

The CUBE Corporation received the highest overall score for Mission Suitability by a moderate margin over the next closest proposal.

CUBE's proposal for Technical Approach was rated Good, with three strengths and one weakness. CUBE's proposal received a strength for its approach to meeting the overall requirements of the RFP in the areas of interfacing with the GSFC logistics contractor, providing specialized testing capability in the chemical laboratory, proposing a proven effective and efficient approach to software development, and its organization for administering telecommunications services. CUBE received a strength for its approach and justification for critical positions that they identified, with effective qualification standards and tailoring experience to base operations functions to provide for a high level of management personnel. The proposed Contract Work Breakdown Structure (CWBS) was a strength for its overall organization of the contract effort which consolidates appropriate Statement of Work (SOW) areas and maximizes potential synergy.

CUBE received a weakness for inadequate baseline staffing for Statement of Work (SOW) 3, (Facilities Operations and Maintenance) and inadequate accommodation for its proposed vacancy rate for the total baseline contract effort. CUBE's Overall Contract Management Approach was rated Excellent, with two significant strengths and three strengths, and stood out as the only excellent rating among the four

offerors. CUBE received a significant strength for its outstanding approach to labor relations which provided an effective course of action that would maximize the amount of flexibility management would have preserving special rates for specific labor categories as warranted. The transition plan was also recognized as a significant strength for proposed technology improvement and an aggressive reliability-centered maintenance program and for specific features having strong correlation with the five future goals identified in the RFP (Safety, Health, and Environmental Leadership; Keeping the Base Operational; Customer Satisfaction; Expanded Capability and Flexibility; and Best Value Effectiveness), including a training approach to drive workforce synergy, an oversight process for performance, investments and business opportunities, and outreach programs.

CUBE had strengths in their staffing approach to SOW 1; in their overall management approach and structure identifying qualified key personnel and demonstrating a very effective communication strategy and span of control with appropriate procurement authorization for the Program Manager; and in their corporate approach to commercial and marketing activities (contract clause H.16).

OMNI Corp.

The OMNI Corporation received the second highest overall numerical score for Mission Suitability, by a moderate margin over the next closest proposal.

OMNI received a Very Good rating for Technical Approach with one significant strength and one strength. OMNI received a significant strength for a strong overall understanding of SOW requirements, demonstrating its ability to realize synergies, identifying key functions applicable to all projects, identifying certain position requirements and identifying critical aspects and metrics especially associated with SOW's 2 (Facilities Planning), 3 (Facilities Operations & Maintenance), 4 (Construction Services), 5 (Grounds Maintenance), 12 (Telecommunications), and 15 (Logistics). They had a strength in their proposed CWBS for appropriately separating costs and for proposing a consolidated organization with appropriate staffing.

OMNI received a Very Good rating for Overall Contract Management Approach with one significant strength and three strengths. The proposal received a significant strength for direct alignment of the overall approach with the five future goals identified in the RFP. This strength included management involvement and proactive monitoring for safety; health and environmental leadership; identifying key objectives for support of partnership missions; mechanisms for measuring and improving customer satisfaction; long range planning and use of new and improved products and services; and work force development, labor relations approach and community participation. OMNI received strengths for a proactive employee involvement program and positive union approach for effective work control approach including scheduling, prioritization and workload fluctuation management; and for strategic business partnership concerning database integration.

Call Henry, Inc.

Call Henry, Incorporated was rated the third highest for Mission Suitability by a very slight margin over the lowest rated proposal

CHI's proposal was rated Good for Technical Approach with three strengths and two weaknesses. The proposal received a strength for Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) staffing by demonstrating a multi-faceted approach to attracting and securing required personnel and an effective approach for work load leveling. The proposal's overall technical approach was effective in demonstrating comprehension of particular areas, discussing cross-contract functions, identifying technical management and cost benefits, proposing appropriate and challenging sample metrics, and discussion of critical aspects for SOW 12. Finally, OMNI identified realistic critical positions with strong rationale and with high minimum qualification requirements.

CHI's proposal received a weakness for failure to match the proposed organization with its CWBS in several areas and failure to adequately explain how skill mix or organization functional synergies will be achieved. The proposal also received a weakness for inadequate and unsupported staffing levels in certain areas of SOW 3.

CHI received a Very Good rating for Overall Contract Management Approach with one significant strength and five strengths. The significant strength was given for their Integrated Resource Management Office, appropriate span of control and autonomy for the program manager and office/division managers, and consolidation of similar SOW functional requirements into synergistic organizational areas, as well as a streamlined and well-structured organization. CHI received a strength for its transition plan encompassing specific proposed approaches for a smooth transition, identification of appropriate and challenging sample metrics, and provision for a fully-functioning Information Management System (IMS) at the beginning of the contract. CHI proposed effective training for management and their workforce. CHI proposed a proactive approach for use and accountability of Government property. CHI demonstrated an effective approach to building a cooperative labor relations environment and the ability to facilitate employees switching to different types of work. Finally, CHI was recognized for its approach for integration and control of all actions affecting quality.

H&H Consolidated, Inc.

H&H Consolidated, Incorporated received the lowest Mission Suitability rating.

The Technical Approach provided by H&H was rated Good, with three strengths. H&H received a strength for effective use of synergies through cross utilization of similar skills. H&H provided a very accurate summary of work necessary for SOW

15, Logistics and identified critical aspects. H&H provided a comprehensive, clear and well organized CWBS.

H&H's Overall Contract Management Approach was rated Good, with five strengths. H&H proposed to use an effective custom developed purchasing system. H&H proposed a minimally disruptive phase-in plan based on employees in place for certain functions and effective phase-in for the remaining functions, identifying necessary critical actions including specified replacements due to lack of training. H&H proposed streamlined levels of communication and high levels of autonomy and span of control for contract management and facilities operations and maintenance., H&H demonstrated an effective approach for work receipt and control. Finally, H&H demonstrated an effective labor relations program and an efficient approach for use of the maintenance labor force.

COST/PRICE FACTOR

The proposed cost/price was assessed to determine reasonableness and cost realism. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B) and (C). For the purposes of source selection, the proposed price, as defined in the RFP, is based on the 10-year sum total of the following:

- (1) The total probable target cost for the baseline requirements, plus the proposed target incentive fee adjusted by the proposed over/under share ratio for the difference between the proposed target cost and the probable cost for each of the years 1-10; plus the proposed award fee amount for years 9-10 for the baseline requirements (derived from Exhibit 1 and supporting cost exhibits); plus,
- (2) The probable total annual number of regular and overtime labor hours (derived from Exhibits 3A and 3B) in excess of baseline labor hours for the IDIQ model (Exhibit 12), multiplied by the weighted (loaded) annual average IDIQ labor rate and the proposed average (for task levels 1-3 from Attachment J-6) target fee rate, for each of the 10 years.

CUBE was evaluated as having the lowest probable cost by a moderate margin, after having submitted the lowest proposed cost. The probable cost reflected an overall upward adjustment, with upward adjustments for unrealistic reduction of hours regarding vacancy rates and for an under-estimation of the staffing requirements in one SOW area as well as downward adjustments for software development and incentive fee.

OMNI was evaluated as having the next lowest probable cost, by a moderate margin. The probable cost reflected an overall downward adjustment with downward adjustments to correct a mathematical error in calculating fringes, which

had a flow-down effect in other areas, a downward adjustment for IDIQ staffing to resolve an inconsistency between the offeror's total staffing and the subcontractor's proposed labor hours, an upward adjustment for indirect rates applicable to subcontracted effort, and an upward adjustment for incentive fee.

CHI was evaluated as having the next lowest probable cost, by a very substantial margin over the highest probable cost. The probable cost reflected an overall downward adjustment, with a small upward adjustment for escalation of one labor category and associated fringe, indirect and award fee adjustments, upward adjustment for incentive fee, and downward adjustment for IDIQ staffing, primarily for Navy desktop Information Technology (IT) management, which offerors were informed during discussions would not be performed under this contract.

H&H was evaluated as having the highest probable cost, after having submitted the highest proposed cost. The probable cost reflected an overall downward adjustment, with downward adjustment for IDIQ staffing primarily for Navy desktop IT management, which offerors were informed during discussion would not be performed under this contract.

The total magnitude of the probable cost adjustment for each of the four offerors was not large enough to require a formula adjustment to their Mission Suitability scores.

PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR

Past Performance was evaluated in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2) and NFS 1815.305(a)(2). The RFP established five specific areas for evaluation: Safety & Quality of Service, Timeliness of Performance, Cost Control, Business Relations, and Customer Satisfaction. Surveys received from references were evaluated, as well as information from other customers known to the Government and consumer protection organizations.

The OMNI team's past performance was rated "Excellent," based upon similar work in operations and maintenance, construction, logistics, grounds maintenance, technical and graphic services, facility engineering, laboratory analysis, communications, and accounting support. CUBE's past performance was rated "Very Good", based on the CUBE team's performance on contracts of similar scope and magnitude in the areas of security, logistics, IT and technical support. CHI's past performance was rated "Very Good," based on CHI's performance on a contract of similar scope and magnitude in the areas of IT support, operations and maintenance, grounds, logistics, security and emergency services. The H&H team's past performance was rated "Very Good," based on performance of the incumbent portion of the WICC contract for operations and maintenance and minor construction and related contracts of its two primary subcontractors.

DECISION


I solicited and received the views of key senior GSFC and Navy personnel who attended the presentation, who read the SEB's report, who have responsibility related to the procurement, and who understand the application of the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP. We queried the evaluators about various aspects of their presentation and findings documented in the SEB's Report. We had follow-up discussions, primarily focusing on the findings of the SEB as to the adequacy of proposed staffing approaches to performing baseline and IDIQ work. I accepted the Mission Suitability findings of the SEB as reflected in the Final Report. I examined the various elements of the proposed costs and agreed with the SEB's assessment that all of the offerors' costs, as adjusted by the SEB, were reasonable for their technical approaches. I deemed the ratings for Past Performance to be reasonably based upon the references provided and information provided by offerors thereon as part of their revised proposals.

CUBE received the highest overall Mission Suitability rating, which was the most important evaluation factor, by a moderate margin over OMNI, and a larger margin over H&H and CHI. CUBE was evaluated as having the lowest probable cost, after having submitted the lowest proposed cost, by a moderate margin over the next lowest probable cost. While the OMNI Team was considered "Excellent" under the Past Performance Factor with CUBE, H&H, and CHI rated "Very Good" overall under this factor, this advantage did not overcome CUBE's advantage in the two most important of the three evaluation factors.

Based on the foregoing, I conclude, for the reasons stated above, that the CUBE proposal is the most advantageous to the Government. Accordingly, I selected the CUBE proposal for award of the Wallops Institutional Consolidated Contract.



Alison L. McNally
Director of Management Operations



Date